

## **PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

### **MEETING MINUTES**

**SEPTEMBER 6, 2012**

#### **AGENDA**

##### **New Cases**

1. **Thomas Kohler PCD, Subarea D – Dublin Memory Care Facility**  
**12-029FDP**  
(Approved 7 – 0 Minor Text Amendment)  
(Approved 7 – 0 Final Development Plan)  
**Emerald Parkway  
Final Development Plan**
2. **Dominion Homes PUD**  
**12-051AFDP**  
(Tabled 7 – 0 Minor Text Amendment/Final Development Plan)  
**4900 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard  
Amended Final Development Plan**

##### **Informal Cases**

3. **Riverside PCD North, Subarea A3 – The Perimeter**  
**12-050INF**  
(Informal Discussion)  
**Perimeter Drive  
Informal Review**
4. **Midwestern Auto Group PUD – MAG Audi**  
**12-057INF**  
(Informal Discussion)  
**5875 Venture Drive  
Informal Review**

##### **Administrative Request**

5. **Community Plan 2012 Amendment**  
**12-046ADM**  
(Presentation and Discussion)  
**Administrative Request**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Krumb, Victoria Newell, Warren Fishman, Joe Budde, and John Hardt. City representatives were Claudia Husak, Steve Langworthy, Jennifer Readler, Justin Goodwin, Kristin Yorko, Alan Perkins, Sharonda Whatley, Tori Proehl, and Flora Rogers.

##### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the documents into the record as presented. Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Krumb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Mr. Taylor referred to the August 9, 2012 meeting minutes and requested that on page 2, the word 'Community' be corrected to 'Committee.'

Ms. Krumb requested that the typographical error on page 17, 'Ms. Krumb said suggested...' be corrected.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the August 9, 2012 meeting minutes as corrected. Ms. Kramb seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

### **Communications**

Claudia Husak said to arrange the October daylong trip to Crocker Park, the Commissioners' available dates were needed. She said she would email them about the trip and asked that they each respond by providing three days that they were available. Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested that they consider going between October 9<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>.

Richard Taylor confirmed that the administratively approved sign for the Avery-Muirfield Drive Huntington National Bank was not purple as shown, but gray and three-dimensional.

Amy Kramb asked if the sign would be internally illuminated.

Ms. Husak said that to her knowledge, the sign was internally illuminated.

### **Administrative Business**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that Cases 1 and 2 were on the consent agenda and that Mr. Taylor had requested that they be pulled for questions and discussion. She announced that the cases would be heard in the order of the published Agenda. Ms. Amorose Groomes briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Commission.

### **1. Thomas Kohler PCD, Subarea D – Dublin Memory Care Facility 12-029FDP**

### **Emerald Parkway Final Development Plan**

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for a 33,000-square-foot, one-story nursing care facility and all associated site improvements on a 4-acre parcel within Subarea D of the Thomas Kohler Planned Commerce District. She said the site is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Emerald Parkway with Woerner Temple Road. She swore in those intending to address the Commission regarding this application, including Ben W. Hale, Jr., Smith & Hale LLC (37 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio); representing the applicant, The Edwards Land Company, (495 South High Street, Suite 150, Columbus, Ohio); Carl Sanders, Director of Development, JEA Living (12115 Northeast 99<sup>th</sup> Street, Vancouver, Washington), Andy English, (1589 Newcomer Road, Columbus, Ohio), Jamie Leeseburg, (651 Rose Lane, Gahanna, Ohio), Greg Elmore, Architect, (3150 Kettle Court SE, Salem, Oregon

Claudia Husak presented this case. She said that this was a vacant site with commercial buildings within the Thomas Kohler Planned Commerce District with the Emerald Town Center development across the street. She said to the south is the Tutor Time Daycare and to the north are office buildings and the Camden Professional Center, the BMI Credit Union, and the Gardner Daycare all of which are also within the Thomas Kohler PCD. She said a 75-foot landscape buffer was along all the rear of the site. She explained that the 75-foot landscape buffer which includes a bike path was developed as part of the zoning for the Thomas-Kohler PCD in 2000. Ms. Husak said the existing access drive from Emerald Parkway is shared with Tutor Time and the undeveloped parcel to the south. She said a curb has been dropped to the north and Planning has requested that the applicant restore the curb as part of this project.

Ms. Husak said the proposed 66-bed Alzheimer's Care building is centered on the site and will share the existing shared drive. She said visitor, patient drop-off, and ambulance parking is located on the east side, along Emerald Parkway. She said a service area located to the west of the building includes a

dumpster enclosure, a generator, and a transformer. Ms. Husak said the service area also provides delivery access and a turnaround for emergency vehicles. She said Planning is requesting a condition that wheel stops be installed along the parking spaces that back or front the sidewalk. Ms. Husak said a landscaped courtyard, interior to the site, and landscape areas for the facility residents along Woerner-Temple frontage are proposed. She said that a fence is proposed to enclose the facility. Ms. Husak said stormwater is proposed to be in larger rain garden type settings. She said area screening is proposed along all the parking areas and drive aisles. Ms. Husak said that Planning also proposes a condition that the applicant screen the meter pit if it is above grade as part of the revision to the landscape plan.

Ms. Husak said the Thomas Kohler PCD text requires stone and brick as the primary building materials. She said existing buildings in the district have set an architectural theme with craftsman-type details. She said the applicant proposes stone and brick as their primary building materials with stucco along the roofline. Ms. Husak said that Planning has shared their concerns with the applicant about the length of the building, especially along the Emerald Parkway frontage. She said the concerns were addressed by the applicant by including dormers to break up the mass of the roof and including some bump outs in the overhang of the roof in front of the drop off area. She presented a perspective of how the building would look with landscaping around it with the material colors.

Ms. Husak said air conditioning units are proposed to provide the ability to individually regulate the temperature. She said the applicant has been made aware by Planning of the Commission's concern. She said the applicant is proposing to paint the units to match the building materials and install landscaping around the building foundation, so that the visibility of the units are diminished.

Ms. Husak explained that the site is eligible to have two signs because it has frontage on two rights-of-way. She pointed out that there is some discrepancy as to the location of the signs, depending upon which rendering is seen and that the applicant is being asked to rectify it. Ms. Husak said the Woerner-Temple Road sign to the north is not shown on the rendering eight feet from the right-of-way, as required for which a condition is proposed.

Ms. Husak said a six-foot tall fence is proposed along a portion of the site to provide a safe and secure environment for the patients and the outside areas which will require a minor text modification. Ms. Husak said that Planning has worked with the applicant to place stone columns along the Woerner Temple Road frontage of the fence every 30 feet, similar to the design at the Dublin Springs facility on Perimeter Drive. She said not all the plans submitted showed the stone being carried along the entire perimeter of the fence, and Planning wants to verify that is the case. Ms. Husak said Planning also had concerns about the fence location on the west side, near the bike path and landscape buffers, and would like to have the fence moved back about two feet toward the building. Ms. Husak said that Planning was recommending approval of the minor text revision portion of this application. She said also, Planning is recommending approval of this proposed final development plan, with six conditions:

- 1) That, prior to filing for a building permit, the architectural site plan be updated to reconcile the discrepancies in the site data table;
- 2) That stone columns be included along the entire length of the fence spaced in 30-foot intervals on all applicable plan sheets and that the fence be at least two feet from the edge of the landscape buffer;
- 3) That the plans be revised to indicate wheel stops for all parking spaces that front a sidewalk;
- 4) That the replacement of the curb drop located on Woerner Temple Road with curb and gutter to match existing adjacent curb be indicated on the plans;
- 5) That the Woerner Temple Road sign be shown in the same location at least eight from the right-of-way on all applicable plan sheets and that encroachment forms be submitted with the sign permits; and
- 6) That the meter pit be screened with landscaping if it is above grade.

Carl Sanders, Director of Development, JEA Living, said that they were the potential owners and operators of this facility. He explained that their multi-generational family run business with 40 facilities throughout the United States and Canada is committed to honoring the experience of aging. He said the facility is named after the owner, Jerry Erwin, whose mother developed Alzheimer's. Mr. Sanders said that they chose Dublin due to its mix of mature and new housing, a new hospital, demographics that were attractive to them, and the need for this specialized type of use.

Mr. Sanders said that the 66-bed facility had 44 units that were shared, private, or semi-private focused on patients with moderate to severe Alzheimer's or other forms of dementia with specialized programming and care. He said the facility would be staffed by nurses 24 hours per day. He said that they went beyond what they were licensed to do and their goal was to honor the patient's experience any way that they could by providing a specialized type of care that is not now in Dublin.

Ben W Hale, Jr., representing the applicant, said there were about four layers of mounding and landscaping for the individual air conditioning units so that they would not be easily visible.

Jamie Leeseberg, project engineer, said that for the stormwater retention, a wet pond did not lend itself to the site due to the unique clientele at the facility and at Tutor Time and with the size of the building being in the center, there not being a good location. He said they looked at sheet flow off the pavement into the grass areas, directed by swales, and doing bio-basins that are landscaped so that they would not be a focal point of the development. He said bio-basins function by getting water underground by a soil media mix, so plants can use whatever they need, allowing water to cool and be discharged to the site, slowing it down significantly. He explained that the water quality volume would be handled in the individual basins and with a pipe underground in the parking lot to handle stormwater detention before it left the site central. He said there would be one outlet for the entire site, located in the northeast corner at Woerner-Temple Road and Emerald Parkway. He said that working with the existing mounding and the building, the location for the rain garden seemed to make the most sense. Mr. Leeseberg explained they would stay dry, except under extreme circumstances such as a 100-year storm. He said the water trickles slowly into the basins. He said there will be about two to four inches of mulch in places and about four feet of soil media. Mr. Leeseberg said regarding maintenance, any plant material that dies will need to be replaced and mulch added every couple of years. He said six inches to a foot of soil media that picks up smaller particles and clogs the system is removed and replaced. He said they include the specific plans for the contractor that builds for the first time and a maintenance schedule for the owner.

Greg Elmore, project architect, said that they worked hard with Planning to design this project so that it fit in with the neighborhood residents and commercial development area and looked like a residence to their patients.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments regarding this case.

Laura Karawizadeh, (5792 Castleknock, Dublin, Ohio) asked how far the dumpster and were from the neighborhood. She said under State regulations, the generators have to be tested often. She recalled years ago, when a gas station was proposed, the neighborhood fought it because of its pumps, lights, and noise it would generate. She said her biggest concerns were the noise from the generators and the location of the dumpsters located next to the bike path. She did not think the landscaped mound would control the generator noise.

Mr. Hale said in the beginning, they called Councilmember Amy Salay, the Ward Representative, to let her know about this proposed project and ask what she thought of it. He said that the president of the Homeowners Association, Joe McCain was sent information and he offered to meet with him. He said that Mr. McCain said he did not think it was necessary to meet. He said they had reached out to the neighborhood. He said when the property was rezoned in 1995 or 1996, they agreed to put in a mound and landscaping. He said the mounding they were talking about was more along the streets. He said

when looking at the neighborhood, there is the house, 30 or 40-foot backyard, and then 75 feet, then 50 feet before reaching the facilities which are screened.

Mr. Elmore said that the dumpster enclosure, transformer and generator were located beyond a landscape mounded 12-foot high block wall to keep the noise down. He said the only time the wall will be seen is when the dumpster doors are opened. He said their dumpster is farther away from the buffer than the Tutor Time dumpster. He said the same company would service the dumpsters once a week at the same time as Tutor Time has pickup.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked when the generator would be tested.

Mr. Elmore said the generator was tested once a month during the day.

Mr. Hale said food was delivered by truck only once or twice a week.

Laura Karawizadeh said that it was stipulated that the development would be operated 9 to 5; however, there may be a lot of EMS runs in and out of the facilities.

Mr. Elmore said that family members can visit residents anytime 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. He said that all deliveries or trash pickup will happen afterhours. He said the ambulance frequency to these types of buildings is about two or three per month, at most.

Mr. Sanders said that they generate less traffic per acre than a single-family development. He said few of the residents drive.

Mark Merchant, (5834 Castleknock Road, Dublin, Ohio), asked where the air conditioning compressors were located and where they grouped.

Mr. Elmore said that there would be no condensing units. He said they happen under the windows all along the building to avoid stacking condensing units all around the way around the building. He said the window unit they proposed is quieter than a box condensing unit is. He said a mechanical well sits above the kitchen area and it is down into the roofline. Mr. Elmore said showed where the landscaping of the units was proposed. He said there were a few PTAC units located behind the fence and landscaping.

Mr. Merchant asked how security would be handled if someone dangerous escaped from the facility.

Mr. Sanders said they had a multi-step plan in such a case, and the first step was to create a home environment that people do not want to leave. He said that if a resident was deemed missing, they had a minute-by-minute checklist and they documented the elopement. Mr. Sanders said from 2010 until 2012 with a number of communities ranging from 25 to 30, there were 19 elopements. He said that was one-half an elopement per year per community. He said that did not mean that a person ran into someone's yard, it was just documented that they went through their checklist. He said it is minimal. Mr. Sanders said part of their job, being 24 hour staffed beyond what they are regulated for is to create an environment where people feel safe. He said if they do not feel it is their home, it causes people to want to leave. Mr. Sanders explained that they had a proprietary program called Meaningful Moments where all of their care team goes through extensive efforts to meet the needs of their residents so that they want to be there and their family recognizes it is their home. He said it was a documented small issue.

Mr. Sanders said they were not a criminal-based facility. He said they house normal family members of people who live here that are diagnosed with Alzheimer's or other forms of dementia who are unsafe to live in their own home, not unsafe because they are dangerous to others, but because they are confused, disoriented, or having mental degeneration. Mr. Sanders did not know if they had documented any crime

committed by a resident that he knew of, but if there is an area of disorientation, there could be emotional outbursts, but it is in the facility which is by State Assisted Living Code, secured.

Mr. Sanders said the entry door on the front elevation is unsecured, but it enters into a secured entryway. He said every other door was secured with keypads that staff can utilize to get in and out with residents and family members. He said there is also a delayed egress system via State Fire Code that would allow exiting in case of an emergency with proper egress locations for residents to go for safety. Mr. Sanders said everything was documented in their policies and procedures that are reviewed by the State. He said that the area in the back can act as an area of rescue assistance, yet it is still secure.

Mr. Merchant asked about security lighting behind the building on the west side.

Mr. Sanders said there was no lighting up high behind the building, except for bollards along the pathway. He said the idea was that they were trying to make it feel like a residence and non-imposing.

Amy Kramb pointed out that a brochure submitted by the applicant was available to Mr. Merchant about the generator and air conditioning units included sound information.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited additional public comments regarding this case. [There was none.]

Richard Taylor asked if the two signs proposed were illuminated.

Ms. Husak said that they were proposed to be exteriorly illuminated with ground lighting, screened with landscaping as shown on the landscape plan which met Code.

Mr. Taylor noted that the font shown on the sign plan was not very interesting.

Mr. Sanders said that the font was just being used as a placeholder. He said the facility had not been named yet. He said it would be a locally appropriate name and they were open about which font to use.

Mr. Taylor said that they should give the font some style.

John Hardt asked if the proposed up lighting fixture, 'FF' for the signs was being used elsewhere.

Mr. Elmore said no.

Mr. Taylor said he was satisfied that the dumpster enclosure was well screened and he liked that it was mounded. Mr. Taylor said that the Commission had struggled on many buildings with the PTAC units, but it looked like they had addressed them as best they could. He said his concern was that it looked like the shrubbery was planted too close to it.

Mr. Taylor said the architecture that is shared with the office buildings to the north on the other side of Rings Road, differs in that they are pod units that are broken and not one long wall, which obviously cannot be done here. He said because of that, there is more verticality in the architecture. He said he thought the material application reinforced the horizontal aspect. He said he would rather see the brick taken all the way up or rather than distributing the stucco and brick horizontally, distribute it vertically. He said to find some nice places to do a panel of brick and intersperse other material so that there is a little more vertical on that.

Mr. Hardt said referred to the brochure regarding the generator and air conditioning units. He said that the applicant is proposing to utilize the optional sound deadening enclosure on the generator which puts the noise level at 72 decibels which he understood was about the same as a vacuum cleaner noise. He said with the noise level of a vacuum cleaner inside a concrete block enclosure with Emerald Parkway

nearby, the daytime testing of the generator seemed perfectly reasonable. He said according to the table in the brochure, when the air conditioning units are on high, they are about 61 decibels. Mr. Hardt asked if the applicants had planned to use the STC, standard transmission classification kit that would improve things. Mr. Hardt said he was satisfied, providing that it was the product they use.

Mr. Elmore said they were the units they will use. He said they had used the units and generator in at least the last dozen of their facilities.

Mr. Hardt referred to the proposed decorative lantern-styled light fixture, 'G-3' and asked if they were relying on it for illumination.

Mr. Elmore said that it was for decoration.

Mr. Hardt said he would not mind seeing it go away. He said the submission indicated that the fixture will have three 60 watt bulbs totaling 180 watts, which did not work for him. He suggested either a five or a 15 watt bulb instead which would make it look like a candlelight and then he would be fine with it.

Mr. Elmore said that they would be just on the front entrance on the porte cochere.

Amy Kramb asked if a louver placed over the air conditioning units for screening had been considered.

Mr. Elmore said that they found in the past that a louver accented the unit, and that the proposed landscape screening was the best solution.

Ms. Kramb noted that the west elevation was very long. She said she preferred the dormers not to be added to break up the roofline. She said she liked the idea of something vertical be used and not banded to make it look longer.

Mr. Elmore said the west elevation was deceiving. He said it was a 'P' shaped building. He said the fence proposed would cover the west elevation. Mr. Elmore said the Camden Professional Office looked like one building from a distance, but had three pods.

Ms. Kramb asked if there would be directional signs within the complex.

Mr. Elmore said they might put signs at the pedestrian entrance off Emerald Parkway, and where the shared drive splits, a 'Deliveries to the Back' sign, and a 'Main Entrance' sign in the front, but he did not know that would be the case.

Ms. Husak explained that directional signs do not require a sign permit. She said that Code regulations control the size and content. She said they cannot have their name on the directional sign, only an address.

Mr. Sanders said that they were a destination and that people knew what, and why they are there. He said given the unique specific entrance with Tutor Time, he thought they would probably put an arrow and address on a small, minimal sized sign.

Ms. Kramb asked if the existing evergreens would be removed for the new driveway.

Mr. Elmore said that the existing evergreen trees were not on their property, but a couple of trees will be lost when the curb cut and driveway are constructed. He said the trees along the sidewalk will remain and they will add street trees. He said the landscaping at the corner Woerner Temple and Emerald Parkway will also remain.



Victoria Newell questioned the applicant if there were specific State Regulations they were complying with that was generating the six foot high fence.

Mr. Elmore said normally, they like the railing at six feet. He said if that was the case, the detail might have to change by pulling the railing the same height as the stone column. He said that Planning said that the maximum height had to be six feet, so they set that stone column there. He said he thought they could do five feet, six inches. He said they are currently checking that possibility with licensing.

Ms. Newell asked to what the 5.6-foot height extended.

Mr. Elmore said the height of the horizontal rail at the top.

Ms. Newell asked if he was aware of the regulation that the fence height had to come up to the elevation.

Mr. Elmore explained that they had not taken this to State licensing yet. He said that was a typical requirement everywhere.

Ms. Newell said on the west elevation, she thought the finishes could be played with a little. She said specifically, there is a lot of stone detailing along the primary elevations of the building and not as much along the west façade. She said she thought there was the ability pull up those materials a little along the west elevation that can accentuate the primary features of the building and could be worked in well along there.

Mr. Hardt said if questions remained as to the regulatory requirements on the fence, he wondered if they should be more careful about the text. He said if the text was modified to say something akin to they can make the fence as tall as the regulatory requirements require whatever that may be, it would match State requirements. He said whatever height the fence was, if the stone piers were four or six inches taller, he would not have any heartburn. He said he thought it would look correct as opposed to making the top of the fence and top of the limestone cap align which will never be possible. He said he was just advocating that they be more cautious about the text language so that they do not create a problem when the applicants try to comply with State regulations.

Mr. Sanders said that they had found a significant difference in the feel from both the outside and the inside of a fence that you can see above easily and how it affects your sense of security and safety. He said it was not just a fence for security in terms of keeping people in, it is also a fence to keep people feeling secure and calm because it is their home. Mr. Sanders said typically, many of their fences are solid, if for some reason there is activity that can cause someone to be extra nervous, having it feel that this fence really is not a security barrier at four feet. He said all of their facilities, nationwide and in Canada have a minimum six-foot high fence. He said they meet or exceed State codes. He said it is the residents' sense of security that is necessary.

Ms. Newell said she agreed.

Joe Budde said that all of his questions had been answered.

Warren Fishman deferred his questions regarding the proposed dry basin to Ms. Amorose Groomes.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this was a nice looking building and was a great use for the site. She said it had less of an impact than something like apartments. She said she also would like to see to a little more relief, particularly on the west elevation architecture.



Ms. Amorose Groomes asked what the percolation rates were anticipated through the rain gardens to make them work.

Mr. Leeseberg said some of the soil in the basin is specifically designed. He said it was a mix used commonly in this area. He said the percolation rate was included in the specifications submitted. He said it was a tested standard media.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if it had a high sand content.

Mr. Leeseberg said that it was a locally manufactured mix that encouraged circulation. He said the idea was to get it down, let the plants get what they need as it works its way through, letting the organisms clean it, and as it gets to the basin bottom, there is an under drain that once it is saturated, will take out through the under drain and encourages it. He said a sand mix will not get into the clay very much.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that on the drawings, there was perforated pipe shown in the basin, and it said there would be either a wall-lined or not wall-lined. She asked what they anticipated would be used.

Mr. Leeseberg said there was either a six or eight-inch perforated pipe with a sock on it, set in a stone bed. He said it would have a lot of water in it and the roots and trees will want to get in there and so they wrapped the whole media with a geo-fabric.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if they could use a solid wall perforated pipe instead of a corrugated pipe. She said with Dublin's heavy clay soil, she was worried about material coming in and plugging up the pipe, even with a sock on it. Ms. Amorose Groomes said the pipe could still be perforated, but with a solid wall which would provide the owner the opportunity to clean it.

Mr. Leeseberg said in the center of the basin is a yard drain and about one-foot above is the basin. He said the best to maximum water elevation at that point it starts overtopping it, they do not worry about actually moving through the soil and getting into the pipe that way. He said it was going into the pipe in overflow. He said that the overflow had a screen on it so that they do not lose mulch or plant material. He said that they designed it not to exceed the 100-elevation in those vial basins. He said regarding the solid wall, their idea is to take the casting off and use a plastic grate so they can get a jet inside if they wanted. He said the collection point where the larger pipe comes is a regular catch basin with a window cut into it and screened to prevent the loss of plant material. He said that they could do maintenance on that and the catch basin would have access to get anything out they cut it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she had seen many rain gardens that did not work.

Mr. Leeseberg said it was important when they were functioning. He said during the construction phase it will be clogged. He said it should not be turned on until everything is stabilized.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were curbs around the entire perimeter of the parking lot.

Mr. Leeseberg said their curbs had breaks in areas, energy dissipaters, stone-lined which allow what ever gets into the stone channel to get out into the grass. He said the fenced area to the north, there is a swale that comes through directed towards the large basin on the north end. He said in the center courtyard, there are three areas. He said they are going to pick up the yard transits, take them under the building, and then route the pipe. Mr. Leeseberg said that they had talked to Kristin Yorko about disconnecting all the roof drains and dumping them on the ground. He said part of the fenced area is to get the residents outside as much as possible, so they did not want to do that. He said there was a small landscaped area with feedback in it and the sidewalk, and they did not want to dump water out onto the sidewalk where residents might slip and fall. He said they may still be able to disconnect the roof drains onto the ground.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there were only two landscape sheets submitted. She asked if they anticipated irrigating the property.

Mr. Leeseberg said they would have irrigation that will address specifically the rain garden areas.

Mr. Leeseberg said that if some landscape did not make it, they would replace it. He said that the applicant will maintain it so that it will look nice.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that there were 89 Black-Eyed Susans proposed and said they should provide more diversity by adding another plant material.

Mr. English said that for everything they were trying to accomplish in terms of color or texture, there were probably five different plants that could fill the need. He said they were open to change any plant requested.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that she was looking for something different for the Rebecca shown on the plant list. She referred to the 121 Old Gold Juniper proposed to screen the condensing or air conditioning units and said she did not know if with their density or thickness, they would provide the screening needed. She suggested they be changed out with boxwood or something else that had a denser texture so that the eye could not see through it.

Mr. English agreed to change out the Old Gold Junipers.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted there was a good distance between the sidewalk and the building, but it looked like all the woody plant material is done in the half closest to the building. She asked if some of that could be pulled out to allow that plant material to mature a little more without interfering with the structure of the building. She said to pull everything 3.5 to 4 feet off the foundation, particularly if boxwoods are used on four sides and do not want anything going into the air conditioning units.

Mr. English agreed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought daylilies would perform okay and suggested different varieties with different bloom times be planted. She said all the plant materials looked nice and she looked forward to seeing them.

Warren Fishman said Ms. Amorose Groomes got all his questions answered.

Mr. Fishman said the Commission had set a precedent for under window air conditioners. He said it certainly had a motel look to him, but he thought with all the landscaping, perhaps it should be noted that if they allowed them, they had to be covered.

Mr. Fishman asked if the boxwood plantings would screen the air conditioner units immediately.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the installation height for the Junipers was 12-inches, and it would be hard to find boxwood less than 20-inches at the time of installation and ultimately, they would grow 36 to 40 inches tall.

Mr. Fishman said it seemed like the dry basin would take a lot of maintenance through the years. He said he really did not want to see in ten years them burned out from the summer and flooded during the rainy seasons. He asked if the facility was sold, how could there be assurance that they will be maintained.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Landscape Code and Code Enforcement would require future maintenance. She said she thought these were designed better than most in Dublin because there is tile with a solid wall in the bottom that can be cleaned with ease to maintain cost-effectively.

Ms. Newell said she did not think it was fair for an applicant or design professionals to think of this as a dry basin because their intention is for it not to function in what is thought of as a dry basin. She said currently, in the design world and with people wanting to become more sustainable, there will be a lot more applications of this. She said they can be handled nicely. Ms. Newell said she thought in this instance, the applicant has really tried to create something that she thought was going to function well. She said they just needed to be maintained like landscaping around a residence.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited additional comments.

Ms. Husak explained that separate motions and votes were necessary for Minor Text Amendment and the Final Development Plan application.

#### **Motion #1 and Vote – Minor Text Amendment**

Mr. Taylor moved to approve this minor text amendment allowing a fence in Subarea D to be taller than four feet in height, in no case shall the fence rails be taller than six feet in height, and masonry accent columns may extend above the height of the fence rails an additional six inches, if architecturally appropriate. Mr. Hardt seconded the motion.

Mr. Hale, on behalf of the applicant, agreed to the text modifications.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Mr. Elmore referred to Condition #2 for the Final Development Plan. He said along their west property line, the proposed fence was close to their building. He asked if the two-foot setback was from the centerline of the fence or clear of the columns.

Kristin Yorko explained that the two-foot setback was for bike path maintenance. She clarified that the actual edge of the columns, not the center, should be two feet away for the bike path towards Woerner Temple Road that loops to go into the tunnel. She requested Condition 2 be revised.

#### **Motion #2 and Vote – Final Development Plan**

Mr. Taylor moved to approve this Final Development Plan application because the proposal complies with the development text, the final development plan criteria, and existing development in the area, with 11 conditions:

- 1) That, prior to filing for a building permit, the architectural site plan be updated to reconcile the discrepancies in the site data table;
- 2) That stone columns be included along the entire length of the fence spaced in 30-foot intervals on all applicable plan sheets and that the fence be at least two feet from the edge of the bike path in the landscape buffer;
- 3) That the plans be revised to indicate wheel stops for all parking spaces that front a sidewalk;
- 4) That the replacement of the curb drop located on Woerner Temple Road with curb and gutter to match existing adjacent curb be indicated on the plans;
- 5) That the Woerner Temple Road sign be shown in the same location at least eight feet from the right-of-way on all applicable plan sheets and that encroachment forms be submitted with the sign permits;
- 6) That the meter pit be screened with landscaping if it is above grade;

- 7) That the applicant work with Planning to revise the sign detail to include a more decorative font;
- 8) That the applicant revise light fixture G1 to lower the wattage or replace the fixture with a lower intensity fixture;
- 9) That the applicant provide a solid wall, perforated pipe for the rain gardens and diversify the plant material palette;
- 10) That the plant material be pulled 3 to 4 feet away from the building foundation and boxwood be substituted for the junipers; and
- 11) That the applicant revise the elevations to redistribute exterior materials to reinforce the vertical dimension of the building rather than the horizontal dimension, or eliminate the stucco as a building material in lieu of brick and stone, subject to approval by Planning.

Mr. Hale, on behalf of the applicant, agreed to the conditions.

Ms. Newell seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Ms. Amorose Groomes called for a break at 8:12 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 8:17 p.m.

## **2. Dominion Homes PUD 12-051AFDP**

### **4900 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard Amended Final Development Plan**

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this Amended Final Development Plan application requesting review and approval to replace a cedar shake roof with dimensional asphalt shingles for the Dominion Homes building. She said the site is located at the northwest corner of the intersection with Tuttle Crossing Boulevard and Frantz Road. She swore in Shawn McAllister, representing the applicant, and City representatives.

Claudia Husak presented this case. She said that the applicant came to Planning with a proposal to change the cedar shake shingles on the building because of maintenance and durability issues. She said they are proposing to use an asphalt shingle. She said that Planning has worked with the applicant to identify a material that mirrors the look of the existing shingle shake, but more dimensional with regular tabs. She said that each story of the three-story Dominion Homes building had portions of roof incorporated into the architectural design. She presented a sample of the proposed shingle in various colors and a photograph showing the existing rooftops. Ms. Husak said the proposed heavier dimensional shingle had more overlap than is typically seen in the Weathered Wood color. She said that Planning thought that the Chaparral Cedar shingle color installed on the building may look more like the cedar material currently on the building. She presented a photograph of Planning's preferred shingle color on a building.

Ms. Husak said that the proposal requires a minor text modification to allow the new roof material because the development text speaks to the cedar roof materials specifically. She said that Planning's recommendation is for two separate motions and votes for the Minor Text Modification to allow the dimensional asphalt shingle as a roof material within the Dominion Homes PUD and to allow the proposed material with the condition that it be the Chaparral Cedar shingle color for the revised roof material.

Mr. Taylor asked if the sign information included in the meeting packet for this application was unintentional.

Ms. Husak apologized that the unintended sign information was accidentally included in the packet for this case.

Shawn McAllister said that the existing 15-year-old shingle shake roof already had problems and they wanted something more substantial to replace it. He said the proposed shingle has a 50-year warranty.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comment. [There was none.]

Richard Taylor said that he understood the maintenance issue, but he was not in favor of the proposed shingle. He asked if any other shingle material besides asphalt had been considered.

Mr. McAllister said that the owner originally wanted conventional shingles, but he suggested something a step above, and that was this. He presented a shingle sample.

Mr. Taylor said that the buildings are very prominent on the corner and the development text calls for this roof to match the original building. He said he they did not want to take quality a step down. He said there were many good alternatives in composite shake, composite slate, and metal roofs that would last as long as or longer than what was proposed. He said a composite shake used in the past had a 50-year warranty and would replicate the roof. He said especially on a tall building like this they would come very close to looking like shake shingles more than conventionally cut shingles. He said to keep the quality of this high and find another material that comes close to the same texture and look as the shakes and that will give the life they are looking for on this building.

John Hardt agreed with Mr. Taylor.

Victoria Newell asked what the exact wording for the proposed new text was.

Ms. Husak said in the text portion that talks about building materials include something along the lines of 'High quality dimensional asphalt imitating cedar shake would also be a permitted roof material'.

Mr. Hardt asked if Planning was proposing that the proposed color and product be written into the text.

Ms. Husak said no, it would just be noted as an amended final development plan.

Amy Kramb said she was leading towards a fake cedar that will last longer, but look more like cedar. She said she saw two versions of this modification. She said one version of the proposed amended text said 'dimensional asphalt shingles' and the other said 'dimensional asphalt singles to imitate cedar'. She said there was a big difference. She said at a minimum, the quality of the dimensional asphalt shingle needed to be clarified in that it is supposed to look like cedar.

Ms. Husak said they could specify all of those descriptors.

Ms. Kramb said she was not in favor of asphalt shingles; however, a fake cedar or another material would be fine.

Victoria Newell said she agreed with Mr. Taylor's comments. She said the roofline on this building is the primary architectural feature, and a great big roof of asphalt shingles is not going to be attractive on it. She said there were other material options available such as tile that will exactly replicate the appearance of the wood shakes and it is commonly used in instances like this. She said she could not support the asphalt shingles being proposed.

Joe Budde said he was anxious to see what the other alternatives looked like, but given the application he saw that is not going to get passed, he couldn't be supportive of this proposal.

Warren Fishman recalled that when this building came in, it was Dominion's idea to do this because they were so concerned about the visibility on the corner and all that roof. He said it was put in the text for a

reason and he did not see any reason to change the text at all. He recalled that Dominion made sure that it was included in the text so that it would be there forever and look good. Mr. Fishman said he was stressed because the standards continue to be lowered for economic reasons. He said no matter how fabulous the shingle is, it is less expensive than shake. He said he would be in favor of changing the text if in allowing something like standing seam metal or something very attractive. He said the asphalt shingle would give the building a whole new look.

Mr. McAllister said he would be in favor of the composite shake.

Mr. Fishman said he would have to see the composite shake proposed before he would be willing to change the text to allow it. He said originally, it was specified that hand-split shake shingles were to be used but he did not know if the second application was hand-split shakes which last a lot longer. He said it was thicker, better, and required less maintenance, but it was more expensive. He said that in Dublin, many times for the second go around on shake roofs, a machine cut shake was substituted. He said they have to be very careful not to lower standards in Dublin. He said obviously, he was against the proposed shakes.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if this was the second shake roof on this building.

Mr. McAllister confirmed. He said a well-maintained shake roof usually lasted 30 years.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant if it was his pleasure to have the Commission table this case to allow him further research of roof materials and come back with other options.

Mr. McAllister asked if a composite shake had been previously approved by the Commission.

Ms. Amorose Groomes could not recollect one.

Mr. McAllister requested a tabling of this minor text amendment and amended final development plan application.

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Taylor moved to table this minor text amendment and amended final development plan application at the request of the applicant. Mr. Fishman seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Tabled 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said if the Commission needed to waive any time requirements, or if they are in a hurry, Planning would work with the applicant.

### **3. Riverside PCD North, Subarea A3 – The Perimeter 12-050INF**

#### **Perimeter Drive Informal Review**

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced the following application requesting a informal review and non-binding feedback for the potential development of a vacant 2.9-acre site with an approximately 14,000-square-foot retail building including two 5,000-square-foot restaurant spaces and associated patios in Subarea A3 of the Riverside Planned Commerce District North. She said the site is located on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections with Avery-Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive.

Claudia Husak presented this case. She explained that the next step the applicant would take after this informal, non-binding discussion was a rezoning/preliminary development plan application. She said the

entire Riverside Planned Commerce District includes the Shoppes of Avery Square, Primrose Daycare, and several office buildings, which are mostly medical. She said this site is in the center of the PCD and the other vacant pieces within the District have approved final development plans but have not been built yet. She said the Community Plan shows this site as the General Commercial category, which is also the category for the eastern portion of this development district as well as the Avery Square Shopping Center and the area of the Giant Eagle Shopping Center, Perimeter Shopping Center.

Ms. Husak said the General Commercial District is described as including most of the existing and commercial development within the City and it is also described that a lot of the pattern of that development in the commercial district is very auto-oriented with uses such as retail, restaurants, personal services, offices, lodging and other auto-oriented services. Ms. Husak presented a subarea map and said that a majority of this site is in Subarea A1, which permits medical offices and regular offices, the Suburban Office and Institutional District in the Zoning Code.

Ms. Husak said that Subarea A3 is the one that the applicant would be proposing to rezone to expand the uses permitted. She said currently permitted are all of the uses listed under the Permitted section in the SO, Suburban Office portion of the Zoning Code, which are mostly office uses and financial institutions. She said also permitted in the subarea currently are two restaurants limited to a total of 11,000 square feet. Ms. Husak said that there was a specific exclusion for drive-thru, drive-up windows.

Ms. Husak presented the applicant's contemplated site plan, which centered around a 14,000-square-foot retail building which could accommodate two restaurants potentially at either end. She said the applicant is proposing to open up the text to allow general commercial uses in addition to the uses currently permitted to mirror what the Matt the Miller's building is currently laid out as with a restaurant and different kinds of uses that would be permitted in a general commercial district. Ms. Husak said that would require a rezoning because those uses are not currently permitted within the current district. She reiterated that there was a cap on the square footage of restaurants permitted within this subarea. Ms. Husak said if the applicant wanted to have those uses opened up to allow all kinds of commercial uses, an ice cream or coffee shop or a use like that which could also be considered a restaurant could be envisioned. She said there is some limitation if the text is kept at the 11,000 square-feet of restaurant use.

Ms. Husak said if the patios are included as this proposal suggests with the restaurant, they would be limited in size because quickly they add up to 500 square feet each and they are at 11,000 square feet, the current cap for the restaurants. So a discussion point outlined was should the patios be counted as part of the restaurant space number, or is there the opportunity to allow patios to be bigger and more of an amenity and more integrated and potentially not be counted as part of an overall square footage number.

Ms. Husak said that they would look at something similar to what they have done at Giant Eagle and at the Kroger shopping centers with allowing a certain overall number of patio space by right with certain amenities that they have come to be used to in Dublin.

Ms. Husak said that the applicant also provided some conceptual elevations of this type of building. She said that the development text currently requires non-office buildings to have a more residential feel and style. She said the applicant is trying to mirror what has been the look of the Matt the Miller's building and other buildings that Daimler has developed around the area.

Ms. Husak said that Planning suggests the following four general questions for the Commission to discuss:

1. Does this proposal warrant a change to the development text to allow retail uses in this Subarea?
2. Would the Commission allow additional restaurants to occupy the retail spaces, which would exceed the number of restaurants currently permitted?



3. Does the Commission support excluding patio spaces from the restaurant size limitation?
4. Is the proposed architectural character appropriate for this development?

Paul Ghidotti, 6840 McNeil Drive, Dublin, with the Daimler Group, said the architectural style of this building was similar to the Wine Bistro building, across from the Shoppes at Lane Avenue. He said they thought this architecture was a step above that of the Matt the Miller building. Mr. Ghidotti said that in 2003, they partnered with OhioHealth on this 24-acre development and created a mix of uses, 100,000 square feet of office and medical office space. He said they had talked to five restaurants over the eight-year period since they started the development. He said every time a restaurant laid out a 5,000 to 7,000 square-foot restaurant, they found that after they met setback and parking requirements and did a freestanding building, that they needed 2.2 to 2.4 acres which left them with an unusable parcel. He said the second problem they encountered was that they could not afford to build a building that met the standard of the Shoppes at Avery.

Mr. Ghidotti said it was his impression most of the second and third generation space that had been developed at Avery Square and the Giant Eagle center have mostly been quick service restaurants which are wonderful to have, but they have not generated any real nice sit down restaurants other than Matt the Millers and The Rusty Bucket. He said two restaurants have come to them; one an Italian family-oriented pizza, pasta restaurant and the tenant previously mentioned that was on Lane Avenue would like to have a Dublin location.

Mr. Ghidotti said the reason why bringing the uses together and creating a single building make sense is that the type of uses he is talking about cannot afford a \$2M restaurant, but they can afford to rent a restaurant like this. He said they can have complementary uses if they can make it one building when there is a restaurant that is only busy at night and a user that may be a neighborhood retail service that can provide a service that people will use during the day, but not necessarily at night. Mr. Ghidotti said they did not have anyone identified yet for what is known as a retail space or letters of intent signed for the restaurant spaces. Mr. Ghidotti asked for the Commissioners' questions and feedback so that they could come back with a plan that incorporated the things the Commissioners would like to see.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments with respect to this application. [There were none.]

Amy Kramb said that she was in favor of the building being shared with two restaurants, but not in favor of the retail. She was also fine with adding patio space not being included and/or adjusting the amount of square footage allowed. She said she was okay with the character of the building, but she was tired of seeing the same thing repeatedly and would like to see something new. Ms. Kramb said asked if the Development Text would need to be changed to allow the restaurant use.

Ms. Husak said the development text would not need to be changed to allow a restaurant at the site, but it would require a rezoning to add other non-office commercial uses.

Ms. Kramb said that she would be willing to change the development text to allow a larger square footage or somehow not include the patio space in the square footage.

Ms. Husak asked if Ms. Kramb would be in favor of allowing more than two restaurants.

Ms. Kramb said no, due to the strained parking in the entire development.

John Hardt said that he thought this was a good proposal and supported it. He said having dealt with similar sites in his profession, he could sympathize how a freestanding restaurant really did not work on this site, so the fundamental approach is okay to him. Mr. Hardt said that he was not concerned about the retail. He said the size they are talking about make them Mom and Pop shops. He said there was 100,000 square feet of retail across the street, so he did not see how this would markedly change the

character of the area. Mr. Hardt said that in the past, there had been some concern about retail creep going westward down Perimeter Drive, and he was sympathetic to that, but he was okay with this proposal for a couple of reasons. He said most of the land to the west is developed and he did not think there was a lot of opportunity for retail left. Mr. Hardt said that the Community Plan had this site being contemplated as being commercial and the offices to the west. He said if they leaned on the Community Plan, this was an appropriate use.

Mr. Hardt said there were two different related issues and one was the quantity of restaurants and the other is the area of the restaurants. He said he had the same concern as Ms. Kramb about the parking and he wanted to be convinced that they deal with that. Mr. Hardt said he was willing to consider some latitude in terms of the square footage and if it was 11,500 square feet, it would allow potentially one of the small retail spaces to be a restaurant. He said he agreed with the comments in the Planning Report regarding the patios. He said he was in favor of the patios because he thought we needed more of them. Mr. Hardt said he would like to see them incorporated into this project in a creative way. He said regarding the eastern restaurant, the entire area between the building and parking lot could be a patio, as long as it was done well, well appointed, and landscaped. He said he did not think it needed to be a 500-square-foot box.

Mr. Hardt said architecturally, he agreed with Ms. Kramb about being over this style and tired of it. He said he would love to see some more interesting, creative things happen, but probably somewhere else. He said on this site, the die has been cast and this is what we have. He said he had no trouble matching the existing center because he thought it was the appropriate thing to do and he thought this building did a good job of it. He said he was willing to look and consider more creative and different approaches to the signs, but on this site, it has been established and done and continuing it was fine with him in this case. Mr. Hardt said overall, this was a good proposal with some details left to be worked out. He said that as a resident of the nearby area, he would welcome the restaurants.

Victoria Newell agreed that the architecture has been established in the area and what had been presented looked nice and it matched. Ms. Newell said she could support having the restaurants in the area and agreed that if the outdoor patio spaces should be done well and creatively. She said she was concerned about retail in terms of how she perceived it would remain empty and add to the existing empty retail all around which was not a good thing. Ms. Newell said that there was not a means of getting foot traffic to the location, so more car traffic is being generated with it. She said the area gets very congested with traffic and she was concerned that more retail would add to the traffic.

Joe Budde referred to the south elevation and asked if something similar would be on the other side. He asked about deliveries and trash pickup.

Carter Bean, Carter Bean Architects, 4400 North High Street, explained that it was very similar to the existing shops where all the services come and go through the front door.

Mr. Budde suggested if they were building a 15,000 square-foot building, why not have three similarly sized restaurants if the retail created heartburn.

Warren Fishman emphasized that he would want to see the restaurant be very successful, and the big problems are parking and access. He said the parking lot is packed by Matt the Miller's Sunday Brunch customers. He said parking for retail customers may be a potential problem due to large restaurant crowds. He said he was in favor of the proposal for the restaurants, but had mixed feelings about the retail use. He said he liked the architecture. He said he thought there might be a parking and access problem having a high volume restaurant along with Matt the Miller's.

Richard Taylor said that as long as the parking situation was remedied, he was not very concerned whether there were two or three restaurants, patios or not, and retail or not. He said it was interesting

that when uses are set in the development text to look back at conversations that took place and try to figure out where that came from. He said that Mr. Ghidotti did a good job of explaining it to him. He said when there was nothing there, it made sense to limit the uses, but there is nowhere else for retail to go except here at this point. He said they were talking about small retail, so he had no problem with that.

Mr. Taylor said the architecture of the building looked fine. He said he would rather retail centers that have a common architecture have it be this Irish town theme than storefront, glass, and brick like is seen everywhere but Dublin. Mr. Taylor said they are facing the back of a retail center, so if the signs were neon, which are not allowed, they would not offend anybody because they would not face a residence or business. He said to get away from these scallop edged, colonial signs and do something interesting and creative. Mr. Taylor said not to just use channel letters. He said at Bridgepointe, they did not use gooseneck fixtures but used a light that lights more evenly and did not draw attention to the fixture so just the light is seen. He said he saw on the plan four identical signs with different words on them. He suggested four signs that reflected the businesses inside. Mr. Taylor said regarding the trade-off on the building size and patios, as long as the total number of parking spaces is addressed, there should be the opportunity.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not have any heartburn about the retail. She said there was not one vacant retail spot near Piada. She said that we may be a little underserved on retail right through there. She said if it was the right retail, it is healthy, and she anticipated that this would experience that same sort of evolution. She said she did not have a problem with two restaurants or the size. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would like to see shared parking agreements, so at least the employees could park somewhere else. She said that there were many medical office uses that would have significantly different peak hours than the applicant's. Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the patio spaces are great, as long as they are treated well and their boundaries are treated well with landscape treatments and the proper fencing and all that creates an environment that is welcoming, rich, and warm. She said she was okay with architecture.

Ms. Krumb added a caveat to her opposition to the retail use was tied to parking. She said the problem she saw with retail was that parking spaces are assigned to them only. She said the shared parking agreements were a great idea. She said this is definitely better than the other plaza and easier to access.

Mr. Ghidotti agreed that the access for the Shoppes at Avery is awful on a private drive which was forced with the geometry to ensure that vehicles could only go in and not come out of there. He said this plan is completely different because the access points are already established and there are two points on both the east and west side where the two private drives come out to Perimeter Drive. He said it will be much easier to get in and out of this site. He said that although there are complaints about the access, Matt the Miller's revenue has increased double digits every year they have been open.

Mr. Ghidotti said regarding concerns mentioned about retail, he said the complementary uses of the restaurants and the retails are such that they really could not do 15,000 square feet of restaurant on this site. He said it would not work from a parking standpoint. He said the reason why they can try to make this work with this kind of complementary use is about daytime, travel times, and parking is that it works better. He said if the Commission is comfortable with this, they will come back with a use that is this size and type of use. He said there are no walls between each of the spaces inside, and if a restaurant needs 400 square feet or 5,200 square feet, they will make it work for their use.

Ms. Newell clarified her comment in regards to the retail. She said her concern was that it was isolated and there is no encouragement for foot traffic.

Mr. Ghidotti said at the Shoppes at Avery for FedEx they established three dedicated parking spaces at their front door for drop offs. He said most retail tenants love that because their customers can park at their front door. He said that might be an option.

Ms. Newell said she actually would like to see the retail foot traffic encouraged. She said when there are interconnected walking paths from one location to the other and it is a pleasant transition, people who go to restaurants want to wander before or after dinner or while they are waiting for tables.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there was nothing that required a vote and she concluded the discussion. She thanked Mr. Ghidotti and said the Commission looked forward to great things.

#### **4. Midwestern Auto Group PUD – MAG Audi 12-057INF**

#### **5875 Venture Drive Informal Review**

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this application requesting an informal review and non-binding feedback for architectural revisions to a dealership for the Audi franchise for the Midwestern Auto Group dealership campus. She said the site is located on the south side of Venture Drive, north of US33/SR161.

Claudia Husak presented this case. She said that the Commission reviewed an application recently for the BMW and Mini portion of the MAG campus to incorporate the Audi building as a free-standing building and at the meeting, the Commission requested that the Audi building come back for another review of the architecture because of concerns regarding the form of the building, the materials used not meeting the development text or complementing the campus. She said as a first step, the applicant requests informal review and feedback before filing a formal application for an amended final development plan.

Ms. Husak said that the MAG campus incorporates approximately 25 acres. She presented the site plan the Commission previously reviewed and said the building footprint in the center of the site remains the same size as before. She said the service reception area has been moved slightly to the west and the plaza in front of the building to the east has decreased in size a little. Ms. Husak said architecturally, the applicant has increased the height of the building to accommodate a second story, mainly in the service reception area with offices and the showroom, close to US 33 is a lot higher. She said while previously, the building was mainly glass, the applicant has incorporated metal and cement fiberboard to the building elevations. She said glass is primarily along the front elevation and a metal panel with a honeycomb pattern overlay has been applied in a manner to create angles and edges which was something that the Commission honed in on as being prevalent on the MAG campus. Ms. Husak said while the building is still modular in its form, the application of the metal material was intended to mirror what the style is of MAG. Ms. Husak presented a sample of the proposed metal panel with a honeycomb pattern overlay.

Ms. Husak said that Planning had concerns about using the clear glass along the roofline to screen the mechanical units. She presented an elevation showing how the metal screening would look. She said on the elevations, a dotted line indicated a window where the metal backing would be cut out so that there would only be the honeycomb pattern over it so that you could see through it, but it would still be covered. She presented perspectives showing the building views from different angles.

Ms. Husak said the discussion points provided ask whether or not the applicant has addressed the Commission's comments and concerns from the last meeting with either the form of the building or the materials of the building.

Ms. Husak said the applicant has proposed two signs for the building. She said both signs require development text modifications as identified by Planning. She said the wall sign on the south elevation that faces US 33, is proposed to be a logo only without any letters or copy which requires a text modification to allow an additional wall sign in the subarea because the subarea was limited to two wall

signs when it was thought there would be one building in the Subarea with two vehicle brands, BMW and Mini.

Ms. Husak said the second text modification would be for a 50-square-foot sign that is only a logo. She said typically, the Code or the development text would allow a logo 20 percent of the sign area or ten square feet in this case. She said by using just the Audi rings as their sign, it would require a text modification to that particular stipulation. Ms. Husak said their sign is proposed at a height of 26 feet, four inches on that elevation and the development text limits the height of signs, as does the Zoning Code, to 15 feet. She said the sign would require three text modifications.

Ms. Husak said the 4.5-square foot sign proposed on the east elevation by the front door could be considered as part of the signs permitted in the development text as a Brand sign, but Brand signs are identified as ground signs. She said therefore, it would require a text modification to allow a wall sign to be a Brand sign. Ms. Husak said the signs are limited to a height of three feet, three inches and the proposal is for eight feet, six inches. Ms. Husak said another discussion point is what the Commission thinks about these proposed signs. She reiterated the discussion questions:

- 1) Has the applicant made sufficient architectural modifications to address the Commission's concerns regarding development text requirements?
- 2) Are the proposed architectural elevations consistent with the remainder of the MAG campus?
- 3) What architectural details should the applicant consider to address screening requirements?
- 4) Does the Commission support the proposed signs for the Audi building and the required text modifications?

Ben W. Hale, Jr., Smith and Hale, (37 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio) said they had heard what the Commission said last time, and their architect has addressed the issue.

Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance, 165 North Fifth Street, Columbus, Ohio) explained the typology of the architecture and from where it was derived. He said this facility in the Audi brand is known as the Audi terminal which was a special prototype originally from the iconic imagery of a 1930's racetrack in Germany. He said it became the DNA behind the typology of this architecture for the showroom. He said instead of a single building type which is sized to fit the program, the Audi terminal concept is based upon a clear defined car presentation area so every car is allotted a certain square footage, has to be space exactly away from each other, and oriented into a racetrack or a roadway. Mr. Parish said the car presentation area is reminiscent of the racetrack image shown. He said the arrangement of the presentation is site specific, so it depends on where the showroom is located and its relation to its major thoroughfare.

Mr. Parish said not one Audi terminal building is the same. He presented diagrams showing the different relationships of the raceway and how it cuts the mass and creates the roadway. Mr. Parish said the raceway is unique because it slices the back wall of the showroom. He said what begins to happen is the floor of the showroom is now rolled up to create the back wall of the showroom and sort of get to the embankment of a racetrack. He said it really starts at the entry piece at the slash on the front elevation which is the side of an Audi R8. Mr. Parish said it creates a high-end showroom where cars are arranged in a linear fashion along the curved back wall. He said that the interior of this facility really impacts what the exterior of the building looks like.

Mr. Parish said typically, in an Audi facility, there are three defining volumes the showroom room, the service write-up, and the sales area, but in this case, there is no service area since it is handled in the other building. He said that each distinct volume is cluttered with different materials. He said the first material used is the honeycomb perforated metal proposed with a two part system. The ancillary windows for interior offices begin to disappear during the daytime and the perforated material continues past. He said the second material that defines the other volume is the fiber cement board. He said the

product is not part of the Audi prototype, but it is something they would approve. He said he was trying to match the cast concrete on the site, but with a pristine look. He presented daytime and nighttime images of this building in concept with the MAG campus. He said the intention of the cuts and voids in the glass are to start to dematerialize the box building and give it the character of what MAG is about. He said they extended the parapets higher to interiorize them, knowing that MAG has a lot of dynamic rooflines. He said the building takes on another element in the night versus during the day. He said it was really a three-quarter view building.

Mr. Parish said given the building type, it seemed fitting not to have signs on the glass. He said they simplified the sign by removing 'Dublin' and 'Audi' and just having the Audi rings mounted on the perforated metal. He said it was simple, clean, and elegant. He said a modification on the sign height would be necessary because there was not a location on the building elevation.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments in regards to this informal case. [There was none.]

Richard Taylor said he loved the building. He asked about bird nests being built on the building.

Mr. Parish said that Audi stated they had no problems with them the other terminal facilities. He said it would be Audi's first terminal building in Ohio.

Mr. Taylor said with his first impression of the building, he was struck with the automotive detailing. He said he loved the small reveal that to him was a gasket on a car between two body parts. He said the building is the design issue which is good and bad. Mr. Taylor asked if Audi decides not to sell cars in this building, what will happen to it. He said he really liked the iconography of the ring as opposed to the name on the sign.

John Hardt said he liked the building, but it was different and not what he thought the expectation was when the development text was written. He said if Audi has done research regarding bird nests, he would like to see it. He said as mentioned in the Planning Report, he was also concerned about the rooftop mechanicals at the top, and how they are screened. He said the way the signs with the rings were done was interesting. He said he was not comfortable with the sign height. He said it was something that they had been firm on for this campus and throughout the City. He suggested they solve the sign height issue some way. He said regarding materials, he would like to see the colors, fit, and finish on the panel, about the joints and whether the fasteners are concealed or visible. He said that information needs to be included in the packet when the final development plan comes back for review.

Amy Kramb said that she liked this much better than last time. She said she would like to see information how it will be maintained, especially with snow and ice melting. She said she liked just having the Audi rings on the sign, but the sign was too high. She said they needed to be specific how the text is worded because she did not want to change the entire area to allow wall signs that are 8 feet, 6 inches high. She would only want the logo and Audi underneath on the sign. She said she might agree to a slightly higher logo, but that 26.5 feet high in the air would not work.

Warren Fishman complimented Mr. Parish's presentation. He agreed that they should stay within the Code as much as possible. He said the building concept was exciting.

Joe Budde said that this was 'way cool,' and he liked it. He said this was a really cool sign and addressed the Commissioners request for something unique and different for signs.

Victoria Newell said that she appreciated that the applicant listened to the Commission. She said what she saw was much improved. She was also concerned how the honeycomb material and glass will be maintained. She said with the automotive details, the whole building is one big Audi sign. She said she felt that this was the top drawer that Audi was putting on the street. She said she was okay with the



name logo and did not object to the branding sign; however, she was concerned that they were setting a precedent with the branding.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she really liked the building. She said she shared the concern that the rings were too high. Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the Commission would give leeway for size-brand specific, but she did not think there was enough support for the height of the rings. She said there were many opportunities to lower them. She said all the other buildings had ground signs indicating directional specific brands and she did not see where a similar sign could be on this particular plat in terms of branding. She said she was not very concerned about the maintenance of the honeycomb because her experience was that Audi takes care of their things. Ms. Amorose Groomes said to make sure that the mechanicals are not visible. Ms. Amorose Groomes said the building was very exciting and she appreciated the fact that they had gone to the trouble to come up with something more appropriate for the site and does the surrounding architecture justice.

Mr. Parish thanked the Commission.

## **5. Community Plan 2012 Amendment 12-046ADM**

### **Administrative Request**

Chris Amorose Groomes stated that the following application is a request for review of draft modifications to the area plan in the 2007 Community Plan as part of the 2012 Community Plan Amendment process.

Justin Goodwin presented slides and explained the intent for dealing with adjustments to the nine Area Plans. He said overall, there were not a lot of huge changes to the existing graphic plans and recommended land uses. He said they want to reflect recent development that was not entirely consistent with what areas were drawn. He said Delta Energy and the Coffman Park Plans were examples. He said with the exception of area plans being replaced with new planning areas like Bridge Street/ there were no major changes. He said they will thoroughly review the planning issues and design recommendations described in each area plan to make sure they do not need adjusted. Mr. Goodwin said that they want to integrate some of the new planning initiatives and give planning area boundaries the city has developed over the past few years. He said that the first week of October, they will begin bringing specific area plans for the Commission to review.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments. [There were none.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes requested that in the future, for these presentations, either a meeting agenda be cleared or a special meeting be scheduled. She said even with lighter agendas, it might be more appropriate to set aside a separate time or something different could be done.

Ms. Husak said that there were back to back October meetings and only one meeting in November on the first of the month which was filled. She said that they were considering adding a November 8<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked that feedback from the Commissioners regarding a November 8<sup>th</sup> meeting be collected.

### **Communication**

Mr. Langworthy pointed out that all the cases on tonight's agenda were very complex with many issues. He said that Ms. Husak had done an outstanding job and he was really proud of her.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were other comments. [There were none.] She adjourned the meeting at 9:58 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on October 11, 2012.